

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

OCT 27 2006

Docket No. 18195.42

REMARKS

The Examiner is thanked for his/her careful and very thorough Office Action. The Examiner is particularly thanked for the helpful suggestions regarding correction of the alleged informalities. All claim rejections are believed moot in light of the agreements reached in the interview (summarized below) but are hereby respectfully traversed in any event. Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Interview Summary 10.18.2006

Examiners Daniel C. Washburn, Ulka Chauhan

Applicant's representatives Patrick Holmes, Dr. Wei Wei

In this interview, rejection of claims 1, 8, and 11 was discussed.

In reference to claim 8, Examiners asserted that the invention claimed "a table" and a data table per se is not allowed under 35 USC 101.

Examiners agreed the replacement of "a table" with "a computer program product on a computer readable medium including a table" would be acceptable.

In reference to claim 11, Examiners asserted that "signal" and "transmission medium" are not allowed under 35 USC 101 and suggested that the languages used in paragraph [0073] is broader enough to interpret that the definition of "media" would include "signal" and/or "transmission medium".

Examiners agreed the re-wording of paragraph [0073] to clearly define media in a way such that either signal or transmission medium would not be able to read into the definition would be acceptable. Examiners agreed that this classification would not constitute new matter.

Re claim 1, Examiners asserted that "modified edge" in the claim covers "bounding box" taught in Thrasher.

Amendment

page 11 of 15

Application No. 10/634,379

Docket No. 18195.42

Applicants disagreed with Examiners' reading and noted that the original edges were defined from the polygon edges and a modified edge is defined for each original edge in the claim, and therefore, a modified edge is defined for a polygon edge. However, since Examiners agreed that adding "of the polygon" to qualify "modified edge" would make the claim allowable, Applicants agreed to the changes.

Art Rejections

The art rejections are all respectfully traversed.

Note that the amendments to Claims 1, 8, 11, and 18 are intended to be purely formal amendments, and are believed not to change the scope of these claims.

The Examiner has stated that Claims 4 and 21 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claim. Due to the agreements Applicants have with Examiner, Applicants believe that the currently made amendments to claims 1 and 18 of which claims 4 and 21 are dependent claims would make claims 4 and 21 allowable, and their allowance is respectfully requested.

The foregoing amendments to the specification are submitted to improve clarity, and to remove ambiguity asserted by Examiners. These changes are respectfully asserted not to introduce new matter, and their entry is respectfully requested.

Rejections Under 35 USC 101

Claims 8-17 stand rejected under 35 USC Section 101 as non-statutory subject matter.

Dependent Claims 9, 10, and 12-17, which depend directly from "a table" defined in Claim 8 and independent claim 11 were rejected because of claims 8 and 11 as non-statutory subject matter. Since Applicants amended

Amendment

Application No. 10/634,379

page 12 of 15

Docket No. 18195.42

claims 8 and 11 based on the interview agreement with Examiners, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of their rejections.

Rejection Under 35 USC 103(a)

Claims 1-3, 5-13, and 22-24 stand rejected under 35 USC Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sfarti (US 5,528,737) in view of Thrasher et al. (US 6,753,861).

Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections to dependent Claims 2, 3, and 5-7, which depend directly from independent Claim 1, since claim 1 has been amended based on the interview agreement with Examiners.

Further, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections to independent Claim 8 and its dependent claims 9 and 10. Though the introductory paragraph of Examiner's rejection seems to include claim 8 in a 103 art rejection, Examiner did not address claim 8 (or its dependents) under 35 USC 103, and presented no arguments as to why claim 8 is shown in any cited reference. No discussion of art rejections of claim 8 is presented in the Office action. Applicants therefore respectfully assume that those claims were rejected only under 35 USC 101 only, and that the present amendments make the 101 rejections moot. Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Further, Independent claim 11 is rejected under the same references and rationale as rejection to claim 1. The rejections to the claim are therefore believed addressed fully by the arguments made above in favor of claim 1.

Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of rejections to dependent Claims 12, 13, and 15-17, which depend directly from independent Claim 11, for the same rationale.

Finally, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of rejections to dependent Claims 19, 20, and 22-24, which depend directly from independent Claim 18. Independent claim 18 is rejected under the same references and

Amendment

page 13 of 15

Application No. 10/634,379

Docket No. 18195.42

rationale as rejection to claim 1. The rejections to the claim are therefore believed addressed fully by the arguments made above in favor of claim 1.

Thus, for the reasons discussed above, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of this rejection.

Amendment
Application No. 10/634,379

page 14 of 15

Docket No. 18195.42

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

OCT 27 2006

Conclusion

Thus, all grounds of rejection and/or objection are traversed or accommodated, and favorable reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested. The Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned attorney or Robert Groover for an interview to resolve any remaining issues.

October 27, 2006

Respectfully submitted,



Patrick C. R. Holmes, Reg. No. 46,380
Attorney for Applicant

Customer Number 29106

Groover & Holmes
PO Box 802889
Dallas, TX 75380
Tel: 972-980-5840
fax: 972-980-5841

Amendment

Application No. 10/634,379

page 15 of 15